
**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WORKGROUP
SEPTEMBER 11, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Tuesday, September 11, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Management Practices Workgroup held its fourth session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ . Debbie Campora, FTB-CCSAS Project
- ☒ . Nan Flette, LA County CAO
- ☒ . Kevin Harrison, Orange County FSD
- ☒ . Mary Herdegen, Placer County CEO
- ☒ . David Jetton, LA Superior Court
- ☒ . Lisa McCann, DCSS, Policy & Operations
- ☒ . Linda Patterson (Co-Leader), DCSS-Policy & Operations, Facilitator
- ☒ . Pam Rouse, Ventura County FSD
- ☒ . Terri Silveira-Love, Shasta County FSD
- ☒ . Nora O'Brien, ACES
- ☒ . Rachel Subega, Santa Clara County FSD

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Debbie Campora at debbie_campora@ftb.ca.gov

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Linda Patterson opened the discussion with a brief overview of our last meeting, and a review of our objectives for this session.

Kevin Harrison suggested, and the group unanimously approved, the following changes the 8/29/00 minutes:

- Page 4, Section 2. Local Child Support Agencies, first sentence, remove “must be assumed,” add “should be considered.”
- Page 5, Section 3. Recommendation – Management Structure, paragraph b,
 - Line 1: change “include” to “address”
 - Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph:

The creation of an Ombudsman function was not specifically discussed because the department has made a commitment to support this function within the Local Child Support Agencies.

B. TENTATIVE AGENDA

- Review minutes from last meeting
- Review the Pre-Forum Draft Report, dated 8/29/00 (Pam's version)
- Review Revised Draft Report, dated 9/11/00 (George's version)
- Discuss the one-page Short Report
- Discuss the results of Nora's county management practices survey

C. REVIEW OF INITIAL PRE-FORUM DRAFT REPORT, DATED 8/29/00 (PAM'S VERSION)

The group reviewed and discussed the Pre-Forum Draft Report and suggested various changes to text. Lisa McCann recorded the specific changes, will incorporate changes, and present a new draft for tomorrow's meeting.

D. REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT REPORT, DATED 9/11/00 (GEORGE'S VERSION)

The group reviewed and discussed the revised draft report and suggested various changes to text and format. The group did not prefer the Recommendations' format in the revised draft dated 9/11/00. The following decisions were agreed upon:

- Use Larry's report format of 8/23/00.
- Use background and process from Pam's draft.
- Use first two pages of George's revision as edited on 9/11/00, but make Research a subheading of Process.
- Under Results and Recommendation heading, use the two issues and follow breakout shown in the Style Guide.
- From Kevin's initial draft dated 9/6/00, incorporate specific text as identified in Nora's notes from 9/7/00 conference call.

Lisa McCann recorded the specific changes, will incorporate them into a revised draft for distribution at tomorrow's meeting.

E. DISCUSS THE ONE-PAGE SUMMARY

The purpose of the one-page Summary is to summarize Policy Recommendations, Standard Operating Procedures, Best Practices, and Legislation impacts referenced within our Management Practices Report. It was the consensus of the group to postpone the development of the one-page Short Report until Tuesday's meeting.

F. DISCUSS RESULTS OF SURVEY

The group reviewed the 32 county responses to the Management Practices Workgroup's survey for best practices recommendations and identified the following:

1. Management structure: no additional recommendations other than those noted in our 8/29 minutes.
2. Dissemination and implementation of information: communication tools such as email, intranet (i.e., Fresno, Los Angeles), newsletters, Orange County's Toolbooks, and the team concept as described in responses from Orange, Riverside, Los Angeles, and Santa Clara Counties were noted as best practices.
3. Functional teams vs. case management team structure: counties operated under the "beginning to end (cradle to grave)" model, the functional (e.g., Intake, Case Initiation, Establishment, etc.) model, or a hybrid.
4. Current management structure: a majority of the responses suggested they would benefit by having more managers and supervisors. The Workgroup agreed that a "next step"—the areas of Supervisor-to-Caseworker Ratio and Manager-to-Supervisor ratio—should be analyzed.
5. Barriers to management structure and information dissemination: few suggestions were provided.
6. Communication of information among management staff: again, email and face-to-face meetings were used predominantly.

Recommendation: Management meetings should include representatives from all functional areas within the department – training, IT, case management, financial management, personnel, compliance, etc.

7. Attorney role within management: Sonoma County's legal management decision-making role was selected as a best practice recommendation.
8. Information: a majority of comments stated that counties need adequate notice of policy and/or legislative changes to meet budgetary needs and automation changes.

Recommendation: Develop a timeline and process that incorporates state and county needs into the implementation and dissemination process.

G. NEXT MEETING

Our fifth meeting will be held tomorrow, Tuesday, September 12, 2000, 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., 2525 Natomas Park Dr, DCSS Conference Room.

H. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

Lisa will provide the workgroup with an updated Management Practices Report for tomorrow's meeting.

I. ATTACHMENTS

None